

On the algebra of elementary embeddings of a rank into itself

Richard Laver¹

For λ a limit ordinal let $\mathcal{E}_\lambda$ be the set of elementary embeddings $j : (V_\lambda, \epsilon) \rightarrow (V_\lambda, \epsilon)$, j not the identity. Then the existence of a λ such that $\mathcal{E}_\lambda$ is nonempty is a strong large cardinal axiom (Kanamori–Reinhardt–Solovay [5]). For $j \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ let $\text{cr } j$ be the critical point of j . Then $\lambda = \sup\{j^n(\text{cr } j) : n < \omega\}$ (Kunen [7]).

For $j, k \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ let $j \cdot k = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} j(k \cap V_\alpha)$; then $j \cdot k \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ (details are reviewed below). Writing jk for $j \cdot k$, we have that $\cdot$ is nonassociative, noncommutative, and satisfies the left distributive law $a(bc) = (ab)(ac)$. Letting $j \circ k$ be the composition of j and k , it is seen that $(\mathcal{E}_\lambda, \cdot, \circ)$ satisfies $\sum = \{a \circ (b \circ c) = (a \circ b) \circ c, (a \circ b)c = a(bc), a(b \circ c) = ab \circ ac, a \circ b = ab \circ a\}$. $\sum$ implies the left distributive law $(a(bc) = (a \circ b)c = (ab \circ a)c = (ab)(ac))$. For $j \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$, let $\mathcal{A}_j$ be the closure of $\{j\}$ under $\cdot$, and let $\mathcal{P}_j$ be the closure of $\{j\}$ under $\cdot$ and $\circ$. A theorem of [9] is that $\mathcal{A}_j \cong \mathcal{A}$, the free left distributive algebra on one generator, and $\mathcal{P}_j \cong \mathcal{P}$, the free algebra on one generator satisfying $\sum$.

For $j \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ let $\text{cr } \mathcal{A}_j = \{\text{cr } k : k \in \mathcal{A}_j\}$. Let $\kappa_0 = \text{cr } j$, $\kappa_{n+1} = j(\kappa_n)$. Then $\kappa_n = \text{cr } (j^n j) \in \text{cr } \mathcal{A}_j$. But there are other members of $\text{cr } \mathcal{A}_j$; $\text{cr } (([jj]j)(jj))$ is between κ_2 and κ_3 . Let $f(n)$ be the cardinality of $\{\gamma \in \text{cr } \mathcal{A}_j : \kappa_n < \gamma < \kappa_{n+1}\}$. Then $f(0) = 0$, $f(1) = 0$, $f(2) = 1$, but the author, in calculations, noted that there are many critical points of members of $\mathcal{A}_j$ between κ_3 and κ_4 .

At present an upper bound for $f(3)$ hasn't been computed, but Dougherty has calculated a very large lower bound. In addition, Dougherty [4] proved that f eventually dominates the Ackermann function and is thus not primitive recursive. Missing still was a proof that the $f(n)$'s, even for $n = 3$, are finite, that is, that the order type of $\text{cr } \mathcal{A}_j$ is ω . We shall prove this here. It is a joint result with Steel. Namely, Steel in [14] proved that if $k_n \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ ($n < \omega$) and $\ell_n = (((k_0 k_1) k_2) \cdots k_{n-1}) k_n$, then $\sup\{\text{cr } \ell_n : n < \omega\} = \lambda$. This is gotten as a simpler special case of the nontrivial

studies undertaken in [13], [11], [12], [14]. Steel's result plus results in this paper give that each $f(n)$ is finite.

The above methods yield a sequence of algebras $\langle P_n : n < \omega \rangle$, $\text{Card } P_n = 2^n$ (with $\mathcal{A}_j, \mathcal{P}_j$ subalgebras of the inverse limit of $\langle P_n : n < \omega \rangle$), in which computations of the critical points can be carried out. It follows that if w and u are terms in one variable x in the language of $\cdot$ and $\circ$, and $w[j], u[j]$ the corresponding members of $\mathcal{P}_j$, then the question, whether or not $\text{cr}(w[j]) \leq \text{cr}(u[j])$, is recursive and independent of j .

Lastly it is shown that if $k, \ell \in \mathcal{A}_j$ and $k \upharpoonright \text{cr } \mathcal{A}_j = \ell \upharpoonright \text{cr } \mathcal{A}_j$, then $k = \ell$.

The paper is organized as follows. Lemma 1–Theorem 4 are preliminaries and a recalling of some results from [9]. In showing $\mathcal{A}_j \cong \mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{P}_j \cong \mathcal{P}$, a number of combinatorial facts about $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ were proved. One of them, the irreflexivity property, was derived from a large cardinal axiom. Recently Dehornoy [3] has proved irreflexivity in ZFC; thus the known results on the structure of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ are true in ZFC. Theorems 5 and 6 summarize these properties. Lemma 7–Theorem 13 give the abovementioned results about embeddings.

We assume familiarity with large cardinals and elementary embeddings ([5], [6]). λ will always be a limit ordinal. If $j \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$, extend j to a map $j : V_{\lambda+1} \rightarrow V_{\lambda+1}$ by defining, for $A \subseteq V_\lambda$, $j(A) = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} j(A \cap V_\alpha)$. A special case is where A , as a set of ordered pairs, is a $k \in V_\lambda$. That $j(k) \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ may be checked directly; it also follows from

Lemma 1. *For $A \subseteq V_\lambda$, $j : (V_\lambda, \epsilon, A) \rightarrow (V_\lambda, \epsilon, jA)$ is elementary.*

Proof. Suppose Ψ is a first order sentence in the language of $(V_\lambda, \epsilon, C, c_0, \dots, c_r)$, where $C \subseteq V_\lambda$ and each $c_i \in V_\lambda$. Expanding the language, let $\Psi^* = \forall x_0 \dots \forall x_m \Psi'$, Ψ' quantifier free, be the Skolemization of $\Psi : (V_\lambda, \epsilon, C, c_0, \dots, c_r) \models \Psi$ iff there are $f_i : (V_\lambda)^{m_i} \rightarrow V_\lambda$ such that $(V_\lambda, \epsilon, C, c_0, \dots, c_r, f_0, \dots, f_n) \models \Psi^*$. We have that $(V_\lambda, \epsilon, C, c_0, \dots, c_r, f_0, \dots, f_n) \models \Psi^*$ iff, letting $\mathcal{T}_0(x_0, \dots, x_m), \dots, \mathcal{T}_p(x_0, \dots, x_m)$ be the terms occurring in Ψ' , then for eventually all/unboundedly many $\delta < \lambda$,

$(V_\lambda, \epsilon, C \cap V_\delta, c_0 \cap V_\delta, \dots, c_r \cap V_\delta, f_0 \cap V_\delta, \dots, f_n \cap V_\delta) \models \Psi^*$, where Ψ^* is the statement

$\forall x_0 \in V_\delta \cdots \forall x_m \in V_\delta \left[\left(\bigwedge_{i \leq p} \mathcal{T}_i(x_0, \dots, x_m) \text{ exists} \right) \rightarrow \Psi'(x_0, \dots, x_m) \right]$. To prove the lemma, we are given $(V_\lambda, \epsilon, A, a_0, \dots, a_r) \models \Psi$. Pick $f_0, \dots, f_n$ such that $(V_\lambda, \epsilon, A, a_0, \dots, a_r, f_0, \dots, f_n) \models \Psi^*$. Then for eventually all $\delta < \lambda$, $(V_\delta, \epsilon, A \cap V_\delta, a_0, \dots, a_r, f_0 \cap V_\delta, \dots, f_n \cap V_\delta) \models \Psi_\delta^*$, whence by elementarity $(V_{j\delta}, \epsilon, jA \cap V_{j\delta}, ja_0, \dots, ja_r, jf_0 \cap V_{j\delta}, \dots, jf_n \cap V_{j\delta}) \models \Psi_{j\delta}^*$. Thus $(V_\lambda, \epsilon, jA, ja_0, \dots, ja_r, jf_0, \dots, jf_n) \models \Psi^*$, so $(V_\lambda, \epsilon, jA, ja_0, \dots, ja_r) \models \Psi$.

For $j, k \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ let $j \cdot k$ (abbreviated jk) = $j(k)$. Let $j \circ k$ be the composition of j and k . For $k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ let $k_0 k_1 k_2 \cdots k_n = (((k_0 k_1) k_2) \cdots) k_n$ and let $k_0 k_1 k_2 \cdots k_{n-1} \circ k_n = (((((k_0 k_1) k_2) \cdots) k_{n-1}) \circ k_n$. Write $k = k_0 k_1 \cdots k_{n-1} * k_n$ to mean that $k = k_0 k_1 \cdots k_{n-1} k_n$ or $k = k_0 k_1 \cdots k_{n-1} \circ k_n$. Make these conventions also for other algebras on operations $\cdot$ and $\circ$. For $\theta < \lambda$ let $\log_k(\theta)$ be the least μ with $k(\mu) \geq \theta$. Define $k \bigcap^* V_\theta$ to be $\{\langle x, y \rangle \in V_\theta \times V_\theta, y \in k(x)\}$. Let $k \stackrel{\theta}{=} \ell$ mean that $k \bigcap^* V_\theta = \ell \bigcap^* V_\theta$, and let $k \stackrel{\theta}{=} \ell$ if $k \upharpoonright V_\theta = \ell \upharpoonright V_\theta$.

The following is a list of properties of $\mathcal{E}_\lambda$ which will be used without comment below. If $k \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$, $\alpha \geq \text{cr } k$, then $k(\alpha) > \alpha$. For $k, j \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$, $\text{cr } kj = k(\text{cr } j)$. If $\alpha < \text{cr } k$, then $kj(\alpha) = k(j\alpha)$. Define $j(< \alpha) = \sup\{j\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$. We have $j(< \alpha) < j(\alpha)$ iff $\text{cf } \alpha \geq \text{cr } j$; $(j \circ k)(< \alpha) = j(< k(< \alpha))$. If $k, \ell_0, \ell_1, \dots, \ell_n \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ and $\text{cr } k = \gamma$, then $k\ell_0\ell_1 \cdots \ell_{n-1} * \ell_n \stackrel{\gamma}{=} \ell_0\ell_1 \cdots \ell_{n-1} * \ell_n$.

Let $\mu = \log_k \theta$. Then if $k \stackrel{\theta}{=} \ell$, then $\mu = \log_\ell \theta$. $k \stackrel{\theta}{=} \ell \Rightarrow k \stackrel{\theta}{=} \ell \Rightarrow k \stackrel{\mu}{=} \ell$. $k\ell \bigcap^* V_\theta = k(\ell \bigcap^* V_\mu) \bigcap^* V_\theta$. If $k \stackrel{\theta}{=} k'$, $\ell \stackrel{\theta}{=} \ell'$, then $k \circ \ell \stackrel{\theta}{=} k' \circ \ell'$. If $k \stackrel{\theta}{=} k'$, $\ell \stackrel{\mu}{=} \ell'$, then $k\ell \stackrel{\theta}{=} k'\ell'$.

Lemma 2 ([9]). Suppose $k, \ell_0, \ell_1, \dots, \ell_n \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$. Let $\text{cr } k = \gamma$ and for $m \leq n$, $\theta_m = \min\{k\ell_0 \cdots \ell_i(\gamma) : i < m\}$ (say $\theta_m = \lambda$ if $m = 0$). Then

- (i) $k\ell_0 \cdots \ell_n \stackrel{\theta_n}{=} k(\ell_0 \cdots \ell_n)$.
- (ii) $\theta_n = \min\{k(\ell_0 \cdots \ell_i)(\gamma) : i < n\}$.
- (iii) if for all $m < n$, $\text{cr}(\ell_0 \cdots \ell_m) < \gamma$, then

(a) $\theta_n > k(\gamma)$.

(b) if $\delta < \gamma$ and $(\ell_0 \cdots \ell_n)(\delta) = \gamma$, then $k\ell_0 \cdots \ell_n(\delta) = k(\ell_0 \cdots \ell_n)(\delta) = k(\gamma)$.

Proof. (i) By induction on n . The case $n = 0$ is by definition. Suppose it holds for n .

1. Since $\text{cr } k = \gamma$, $\ell_n \stackrel{\gamma}{=} k\ell_n$. Applying $k\ell_0 \cdots \ell_{n-1}$ to both sides and using the induction hypothesis $k\ell_0 \cdots \ell_{n-1}\ell_n \stackrel{k\ell_0 \cdots \ell_{n-1}(\gamma)}{=} k\ell_0 \cdots \ell_{n-1}(k\ell_n) \stackrel{\theta_{n-1}}{=} k(\ell_0 \cdots \ell_{n-1})(k\ell_n) = k(\ell_0 \cdots \ell_{n-1}\ell_n)$. Since $\theta_n = \min\{k\ell_0 \cdots \ell_{n-1}(\gamma), \theta_{n-1}\}$, we are done.

(ii) By induction on n , using (i). If either of $k\ell_0 \cdots \ell_{n-1}(\gamma)$, $k(\ell_0 \cdots \ell_{n-1})(\gamma)$ is less than θ_{n-1} , then $k\ell_0 \cdots \ell_{n-1}(\gamma) = k(\ell_0 \cdots \ell_{n-1})(\gamma) = \theta_n$. Otherwise, $\min\{k(\ell_0 \cdots \ell_i)(\gamma) : i < n\} = \min\{k\ell_0 \cdots \ell_i(\gamma) : i < n\} = \theta_{n-1} = \theta_n$.

(iii) For (a), $\theta_n = k(\ell_0 \cdots \ell_i)(\gamma)$ for some $i < n$. And $k(\ell_0 \cdots \ell_i)(\gamma) > k(\ell_0 \cdots \ell_i)[(\log_{\ell_0 \cdots \ell_i} \gamma) + 1] = k(\ell_0 \cdots \ell_i)(k[(\log_{\ell_0 \cdots \ell_i} \gamma) + 1]) = k[\ell_0 \cdots \ell_i[(\log_{\ell_0 \cdots \ell_i} \gamma) + 1]] > k(\gamma)$. Part (b) follows from (i) and (iii)(a).

Corollary 3 ([9]). *If $n > 0$, $k_0, k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$, then $k_0 \neq k_0 k_1 \cdots k_{n-1} * k_n$.*

Proof. Assume $k_0 = k_0 k_1 \cdots k_n$. Let $\gamma = \max\{\text{cr}(k_0 k_1 \cdots k_i) : 0 \leq i < n\}$, and let ℓ be a $k_0 k_1 \cdots k_i$ with $\text{cr } \ell = \gamma$. Since $\ell k_{i+1} \cdots k_n k_0 \cdots k_i = \ell$, there would be $u_0, u_1, \dots, u_r$ with $\text{cr } \ell = \gamma$, $\text{cr}(\ell u_0 \cdots u_t) < \gamma$ ($t < r$), and $\text{cr}(\ell u_0 \cdots u_r) = \gamma$. But this is impossible by Lemma 1. I.e., $\gamma = \text{cr}(\ell u_0 \cdots u_r) = \ell u_0 \cdots u_{r-1}(\text{cr } u_r)$, so $\text{cr } u_r < \gamma$ since $\text{cr}(\ell u_0 \cdots u_{r-1}) < \gamma$. Since $\theta_{r-1} > \gamma$, we have $\ell u_0 \cdots u_{r-1}(\text{cr } u_r) = \ell(u_0 \cdots u_{r-1})(\ell(\text{cr } r)) = \ell(u_0 \cdots u_{r-1}(\text{cr } u_r))$, but $\gamma \notin \text{range } \ell$, a contradiction. And if $k_0 = k_0 k_1 \cdots k_{n-1} \circ k_n$, then $k_0 k_1 = k_0 k_1 \cdots k_{n-1}(k_n k_i)$, which reduces to the previous case.

Recall that $\mathcal{A}$ is the free algebra on one generator x satisfying the left distributive law, and $\mathcal{P}$ is the free algebra on one generator x satisfying $\sum$. Then $\mathcal{A} = A/\equiv$, where A is the set of terms in the language of $\cdot$ in one variable x , and for $w, v \in A$, $w \equiv v$ if w and v are equivalent using the left distributive law. Similarly $\mathcal{P} = P/\equiv$, where P is the set of terms in x in the language of $\cdot$ and $\circ$, and $\equiv$ means equivalent using $\sum$. The same notation $\equiv$ is used because if $u, v \in A$ and $u \equiv v$ via $\sum$, then $u \equiv v$ via the left distributive law ([9], section 1). So $\mathcal{A}$ may be viewed as a subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}$ restricted to $\cdot$.

Theorem 4 ([9]). *For $j \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$, $\mathcal{A}_j \cong \mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{P}_j \cong \mathcal{P}$.*

but we recount some general facts about $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{P}$. Every member w of $\mathcal{P}$ is a composition $w_1 \circ w_2 \circ \cdots \circ w_{c(w)}$, each $w_i \in \mathcal{A}$, where $c(w)$ only depends on w . If $w \in \mathcal{P}$, let $w^{(0)} = w$, $w^{(i+1)} = w^{(i)}w^{(i)}$. Then for $i \leq n$, $w^{(i)}w^{(n)} = w^{(n+1)}$ by induction using the left distributive law.

For $u, w \in \mathcal{P}$ write $u < w$ if w can be written as a term of length greater than one in members of $\mathcal{P}$, at least one of which is u . Write $u <_L w$ if u occurs on the left of such a term: $w = uu_0u_1 \cdots u_{n-1} * u_n$. Then $<_L$ is transitive and $x <_L w$ for all $w \in \mathcal{P} - \{x\}$. If $w <_L v$, then $aw <_L a \circ w <_L av$. If $p \in \mathcal{P}$, then it is seen by induction that for sufficiently large n , $p <_L x^{(n)}$ and $px^{(n)} = x^{(n+c(p))}$.

In [9] it was shown that $<_L$ is a linear ordering on $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{P}$. The statement that $<_L$ is irreflexive was derived as a consequence of a large cardinal axiom: it follows from Corollary 3. The remaining part of the linear ordering theorem involved a normal form for the members of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{P}$.

Dehornoy ([1], [2]) independently proved the remaining part of the linear ordering theorem (that for all $a, b \in A$ at least one of $a <_L b$, $a = b$, $b <_L a$ holds) in ZFC, by a different method. For $u, v \in A$, let $u \rightarrow v$ mean that there is a sequence $u = u_0, u_1, \dots, u_n = v$ where u_{i+1} comes from u_i by replacing a component of the form $a(bc)$ by $(ab)(ac)$. Then ([1]) the rewriting rules for $\mathcal{A}$ are confluent: if $u, v \in A$, $u \equiv v$, then for some $r \in A$, $u \rightarrow r$ and $v \rightarrow r$. More recently ([3]) Dehornoy has proved the irreflexivity of $<_L$ in ZFC and found a representation of $\mathcal{A}$ in terms of an operation on certain braid words. Theorem 5 contains results about $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ from ([9]), which used irreflexivity and which are now known from ZFC via Theorem 6.

For $u \in \mathcal{P}$ a u -prenormal sequence is a term $u_0u_1 \cdots u_{n-1} * u_n$ ($n \geq 0$) of members of $\mathcal{P}$, where $u = u_0$ and $u_{i+2} \leq_L u_0u_1 \cdots u_i$ for all $i \leq n-2$, and in the case $* = \circ$, $u_n <_L u_0u_1 \cdots u_{n-2}$.

Theorem 5. *On $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{P}$,*

(i) $<_L$ is a linear ordering.

(ii) $u <_L v$ iff u occurs on the left of v iff $u < v$.

(iii) the word problems are decidable.

(iv) if $u \leq_L v$, then there is a (unique) u -prenormal sequence equal to v . Moreover, let (T, ℓ) be the rooted, labelled tree such that $\ell(\text{root}T) = v$, $\ell(t) \leq_L u \Rightarrow t$ is maximal in T , $u <_L \ell(t) = u_0 u_1 \cdots u_{n-1} * u_n$ ($u_0 u_1 \cdots u_{n-1} * u_n$ u -prenormal) $\Rightarrow t$'s immediate successors in T are $t_0, \dots, t_n$ with $\ell(t_i) = u_i$. Then T is finite.

(v) $<_L = <$.

Remarks. The linear orderings of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ both have order type $\omega \cdot (1 + \eta)$. (ii) and (iii) are immediate consequences of (i). (iv) is the division form version [10] of the normal forms of [9]. (v) was derived by the author from (iv); McKenzie derived (v) from (i). To $<_L$ compare v and w in $\mathcal{P}$ using (iv), put v, w in x -division form (the decomposition given by (iv) where $u = x$) and compare the two forms lexicographically (see ([9], [10]) for details).

Let B_∞ be the infinite dimensional braid group (given by generators $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots$ and the relations $\sigma_n \sigma_i = \sigma_i \sigma_n$ ($|i - n| > 1$), $\sigma_n \sigma_{n+1} \sigma_n = \sigma_{n+1} \sigma_n \sigma_{n+1}$). For $\alpha \in B_\infty$ let $s(\alpha)$ be the image of α under the shift map $\sigma_i \rightarrow \sigma_{i+1}$. Dehornoy's bracket operation $[\]$ on B_∞ is defined by $\alpha[\beta] = \alpha \cdot s(\beta) \cdot \sigma_1 \cdot (s\alpha)^{-1}$. This operation is left distributive. If $\mathcal{B}$ is any left distributive algebra on one generator x which satisfies left cancellation (as $\mathcal{A}$ turns out to be, because of the linearity of $<_L$), then the action of a braid generator on a member of $(\mathcal{B})^\omega$, given by $\langle b_1, b_2, \dots, b_i, b_{i+1}, \dots \rangle^{\sigma_i} = \langle b_1, b_2, \dots, b_i b_{i+1}, b_i, \dots \rangle$, extends to a partial action of B_∞ on $(\mathcal{B})^\omega$. And for each $b \in \mathcal{B}$ there is an $\alpha_b \in B_\infty$ such that $\langle x, x, x, \dots \rangle^{\alpha_b} = \langle b, x, x, \dots \rangle$, given by $\alpha_x = \varepsilon$, $\alpha_{bc} = \alpha_b[\alpha_c]$. Letting $\text{cl}(\alpha)$ be the closure of $\{\alpha\}$ under $[\]$, we thus have a homomorphism from $\mathcal{B}$ to $\text{cl}(\varepsilon)$.

Theorem 6 (Dehornoy, [3]).

(i) $<_L$ is irreflexive in ZFC.

(ii) if $\alpha \in B_\infty$, then $(\text{cl}(\alpha), [\]) \cong \mathcal{A}$.

Also included in [3] are applications to B_∞ itself. In Larue [8] a direct proof of one of them is given, which yields a shorter proof of Theorem 6.

Suppose $j, k \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$. Define the n th iterate $I_n(j, k)$ of $\langle j, k \rangle$ by (writing $I_n = I_n(j, k)$) $I_0 = k$, $I_1 = j$, $I_{n+2} = I_{n+1}I_n$. Then $I_{n+1} \circ I_n = j \circ k$ by applications of the $a \circ b = ab \circ a$ law.

Let id be the identity function on V_λ . Topologize $(V_\lambda)^{V_\lambda}$ by taking basic open sets of the form $\{f \in (V_\lambda)^{V_\lambda} : f \upharpoonright V_\theta = g\}$ ($\theta < \lambda$, $g : V_\theta \rightarrow V_\lambda$). Then $\mathcal{E}_\lambda \cup \{\text{id}\}$ is a closed subspace of $(V_\lambda)^{V_\lambda}$. Namely suppose $k \in (V_\lambda)^{V_\lambda}$, $\theta_0 < \dots < \theta_n \dots$, $\sup\{\theta_n : n < \omega\} = \lambda$, $k_n \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ and $k \underset{\theta_n}{=} k_n$. Assume without loss of generality $k_0 \neq \text{id}$, or $k_0 = \kappa_0 < \theta_0$. Then $\kappa_{n+1} = k(\kappa_n)$ is well defined for all n , and by Kunen's theorem for the k_n 's, $\sup\{\kappa_n : n < \omega\} = \lambda$. Since $k \upharpoonright V_{\kappa_n} : (V_{\kappa_n}, \epsilon) \rightarrow (V_{\kappa_{n+1}}, \epsilon)$ is elementary for all n , $k \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$.

A particular case is when k is a direct limit of members of $\mathcal{E}_\lambda$. That is, if $\ell_n \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ ($n < \omega$), let $\varinjlim \langle \ell_n : n < \omega \rangle$ be the direct limit map. Say that $\varinjlim \langle \ell_n : n < \omega \rangle$ stabilizes if for each $x \in V_\lambda$ the sequence $\langle (\ell_n \circ \dots \circ \ell_1 \circ \ell_0)(x) : n < \omega \rangle$ is eventually constant. So if $\varinjlim \langle \ell_n : n < \omega \rangle$ stabilizes, then $\varinjlim \langle \ell_n : n < \omega \rangle \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$.

For $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_\lambda$, let $\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{H}$ be the closure of $\mathcal{H}$ under $\cdot$, and let $\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{H}$ be the closure of $\mathcal{H}$ under $\cdot$ and $\circ$. Let $\overline{\mathcal{H}}$ be the topological closure of $\mathcal{H}$; $\overline{\mathcal{H}} = \{k : \forall \theta < \lambda \exists h \in \mathcal{H} \underset{\theta}{k} = h\}$.

Lemma 7. *If $j, k \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$, $\text{cr } j > \text{cr } k$, $I_n = I_n(j, k)$, then*

- (i) $\text{cr } I_0 = \text{cr } I_2 = \dots$, $\text{cr } I_1 < \text{cr } I_3 < \dots$
- (ii) $I_{2n+2} \underset{\text{cr } I_{2n+1}}{=} j \circ k$
- (iii) n, m odd $\Rightarrow I_n(\text{cr } I_m) < \text{cr } I_{m+2}$ (whence $\sup_i (\text{cr } I_{2i+1}) = \lambda$).
- (iv) if $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_\lambda$, then $\{p \upharpoonright V_\theta : \theta < \lambda, p \in \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{H}\} = \{p \upharpoonright V_\theta : \theta < \lambda, p \in \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{H}\}$, whence $\overline{\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{H}} = \overline{\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{H}}$.

Proof. (i) is clear. For (ii), if $\|x\| < \text{cr } I_{2n+1}$, then $I_{2n+2}(x) = I_{2n+1}I_{2n}(x) = I_{2n+1}I_{2n}(I_{2n+1}x) = I_{2n+1}(I_{2n}x) = I_1(I_0x)$ (as $I_{m+1} \circ I_m = I_1 \circ I_0$).

For (iii), pick $\alpha < \text{cr } I_m$ with $I_{n-1}(\alpha) > \text{cr } I_m$ (possible since $\text{cr } I_{n-1} = \text{cr } I_0 < \text{cr } I_m$). Then $\text{cr } I_{m+2} = I_{m+1}(\text{cr } I_m) > I_{m+1}(\alpha) = j \circ k(\alpha)$ by (ii), and $j \circ k(\alpha) = I_n \circ I_{n-1}(\alpha) \geq I_n(\text{cr } I_m)$. In particular, then, $I_1(\text{cr } I_{2n+1}) < \text{cr } I_{2n+3}$ for all n , so $\sup_i (\text{cr } I_{2i+1}) = \lambda$.

For (iv), let $j, k \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$. Then there is a $p \in \mathcal{A}_{\{j,k\}}$ with $p \stackrel{\theta}{=} (j \circ k)$. Namely, by rewriting $j \circ k$ as $jk \circ j$ if necessary, we may assume $\text{cr } j > \text{cr } k$. Let $I_m = I_m(j, k)$, and pick m with $\text{cr } I_{2m+1} \geq \theta$. Then $I_{2m+2} \stackrel{\theta}{=} (j \circ k)$ (so $\stackrel{\theta}{=} (j \circ k)$) and $I_{2m+2} = I_{2m+1}(I_{2m-1}(\cdots(I_3(I_1 I_0)))) \in \mathcal{A}_{\{j,k\}}$. Then for $p \in \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{H}$ and $\gamma < \lambda$ there is $q \in \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{H}$ with $q \stackrel{\gamma}{=} p$, by induction on $\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{H}$ taking $\theta = p(\gamma)$. This gives (iv).

We show, for a subsequent paper concerning limits, that if $\text{cr } j > \text{cr } k$, $I_n = I_n(j, k)$, then $\lim_{\rightarrow} \langle I_{2n+1} : n < \omega \rangle$ stabilizes.

Lemma 8. *If $j, k \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ and $\text{cr } j > \text{cr } k$ (respectively, $\text{cr } j \leq \text{cr } k$), then there is an $s \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$, s a direct limit of members of $\mathcal{A}_{\{j,k\}}$, with $sk = j \circ k$ (respectively, $sj = j \circ k$).*

Proof. By rewriting $j \circ k$ as $jk \circ j$ if $\text{cr } j \leq \text{cr } k$, the lemma reduces to the $\text{cr } j > \text{cr } k$ case. Let $I_n = I_n(j, k)$. By Lemma 7 (ii) and (iii), $(I_{2n+1} \circ \cdots \circ I_3 \circ I_1)(k) = I_{2n+2} \stackrel{\text{cr } I_{2n+1}}{=} j \circ k$, and $\sup\{\text{cr } I_{2n+1} : n < \omega\} = \lambda$, so it remains to show that $\lim_{\rightarrow} \langle I_{2n+1} : n < \omega \rangle$ stabilizes. If not, then by Lemma 7 (i) there would be an $\alpha < \lambda$ with

$$(I_{2n-1} \circ \cdots \circ I_3 \circ I_1)(\alpha) < (I_{2n+1} \circ I_{2n-1} \circ \cdots \circ I_3 \circ I_1)(\alpha)$$

for all n . Then by Lemma 7 (iii), $\sup\{(I_{2n+1} \circ \cdots \circ I_3 \circ I_1)(\alpha) : n < \omega\} = \lambda$. Pick N such that $k^N(\text{cr } k) > \alpha$. By Lemma 7 (iii), pick m such that $(j \circ k)^N(\text{cr } (j \circ k)) < \text{cr } I_{2m+1}$. Let $\alpha_m = (I_{2m+1} \circ \cdots \circ I_3 \circ I_1)(\alpha) \geq \text{cr } I_{2m+1}$. Then $(I_{2m+1} \circ \cdots \circ I_3 \circ I_1)(k \cap V_\alpha) = (I_{2m+1} \circ \cdots \circ I_3 \circ I_1)(k) \cap V_{\alpha_m} \supseteq (j \circ k) \cap V_{\text{cr } I_{2m+1}}$. But the right hand side (unlike the left hand side) is a map h such that $h^N(\text{cr } h)$ exists, a contradiction.

The inequalities showing that $\lim_{\rightarrow} \langle I_{2n+1} : n < \omega \rangle$ stabilizes, where $I_m = I_m(j, k)$, $\text{cr } j > \text{cr } k$, can also be directly computed. For example, let $\theta_n = (I_{2n+1})^{n+1}(\text{cr } I_{2n+1})$. Then

$$(1) \quad \theta_n = (j \circ k)(\theta_{n-1}) < \text{cr } I_{2n+3}$$

Proof. For $n = 0$, $\theta_0 = I_1(\text{cr } I_1) < \text{cr } I_3$ by Lemma 7 (iii). Assume (1) is true for $n - 1$. Then $\text{cr } I_{2n+1} = \text{cr } I_{2n+1}(\text{cr } I_{2n-1}) \geq I_{2n+1}(\theta_{n-1}) = (j \circ k)(\theta_{n-1})$ (by the

induction hypothesis and Lemma 5 (ii))

$$\begin{aligned} &= I_{2n}(I_{2n-1}(\theta_{n-1})) = I_{2n}(I_{2n-1}((I_{2n-1})^n(\text{cr } I_{2n-1}))) \\ &= I_{2n}((I_{2n-1})^{n+1}(\text{cr } I_{2n-1})) = (I_{2n+1})^{n+1}(\text{cr } I_{2n+1}) = \theta_n \end{aligned}$$

$$(2) \quad \theta_n = I_{2n+1}(I_{2n-1}(\cdots(I_3((I_2)^n(\theta_0)))))$$

Proof. For $n = 0$ the expressions are the same. Assuming it is true for $n - 1$ we have

$$\theta_n = (j \circ k)(\theta_{n-1}) = I_{2n+1}(I_{2n}(\theta_{n-1})) = I_{2n+1}(I_{2n}(I_{2n-1}(I_{2n-3}(\cdots(I_3(I_2^{n-1}(\theta_0))))))),$$

which, since $I_{2k} \circ I_{2k-1} = I_{2k-1} \circ I_{2k-2}$, equals the right hand side of (2).

To see that $\lim_{\rightarrow} \langle I_{2n+1} : n < \omega \rangle$ stabilizes on a given $\alpha < \lambda$, pick N such that $(I_2)^N(\theta_0) > I_1(\alpha)$ (possible since $\text{cr } I_2 < \text{cr } I_1 < I_1(\text{cr } I_1) = \theta_0$). Then by (1) and (2),

$$(I_{2N+1} \circ \cdots \circ I_3 \circ I_1)(\alpha) < (I_{2N+1} \circ \cdots \circ I_3)(I_2^N(\theta_0)) = \theta_N < \text{cr } I_{2N+3}.$$

Theorem 9 (Steel [14]). *If $k_n \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ ($n < \omega$), then $\sup\{\text{cr}(k_0 k_1 \cdots k_n) : n < \omega\} = \lambda$.*

Proof. For proofs of the basic facts about extenders sketched here, see Martin and Steel ([11], [12], [14]). Steel argues as in Mitchell's proof [13] that $\triangleleft$ is well founded on normal ultrafilters, except using extenders. Suppose $\theta < \lambda$. For $k \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ let E_k^θ be the extender of length θ induced by k . That is, for $a \in [\theta]^{<\aleph_0}$ let $\mu_a^k = \log_k(\sup a + 1)$. Let $E_a = \{X \subseteq [\mu_a^k]^{\bar{a}} : a \in k(X)\}$, and define $E_k^\theta = \langle E_a : a \in [\theta]^{<\aleph_0} \rangle$. Let $\text{Ult}(V, E_k^\theta)$ be the ultraproduct of V by E_k^θ . The elements of $\text{Ult}(V, E_k^\theta)$ are equivalence classes $[f, a]$, where $a \in [\theta]^{<\aleph_0}$ and $f : [\mu_a^k]^{\bar{a}} \rightarrow V$. To define when $[f, a] \sim [g, b]$, let $a \cup b$ in increasing order be $\{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r\}$, $a = \{\alpha_{i_0}, \dots, \alpha_{i_n}\}$, $b = \{\alpha_{k_0}, \dots, \alpha_{k_\ell}\}$; then $[f, a] \sim [g, b]$ iff $\{u : \bar{f}(u) = \bar{g}(u)\} \in E_{a \cup b}$, where $\bar{f}(\{\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_r\}) = \{\gamma_{i_0}, \dots, \gamma_{i_n}\}$, $\bar{g}(\{\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_r\}) = \{\gamma_{k_0}, \dots, \gamma_{k_\ell}\}$. Then $\text{Ult}(V, E_k^\theta)$ is well founded. Let $i_k^\theta : V \rightarrow \text{Ult}(V, E_k^\theta)$ be the canonical elementary embedding.

If $\theta < \lambda$ is inaccessible, then claim $V_\theta \subseteq \text{Ult}(V, E_k^\theta)$, in fact for each $[f, a]$

$g : [\delta]^m \rightarrow V_\lambda$, then $[f, a] \in [g, b]$ iff $k\bar{f}(a \cup b) \in k\bar{g}(a \cup b)$. Then by induction on $\rho < \theta$ one establishes $V_\rho \subseteq \text{Ult}(V, E_k^\theta)$ by showing each $kh(\langle \rho, \alpha \rangle)$ ($\alpha < \bar{\bar{V}}_\rho$) is in $\text{Ult}(V, E_k^\theta)$, where $\langle h\langle \delta, \alpha \rangle : \alpha < \bar{\bar{V}}_\delta \rangle$ is a well ordering of V_δ ($\delta \leq \log_k \rho$).

It follows that $i_\ell^\theta \stackrel{\theta}{=} k$ and that if $\ell \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$, then $E_{k\ell}^\theta = i_\ell^\theta(E_\ell^{\log_k \theta}) \cap V_\theta$. So $E_{k\ell}^\theta \in \text{Ult}(V, E_k^\theta)$ and is, there, the extender of length θ induced by $i_\ell^\theta(\ell)$. Suppose $\theta < \lambda$ is inaccessible, $k, k\ell \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ and $\text{cr } k < \theta$. Then we claim that $i_\ell^\theta(\theta) > i_{k\ell}^\theta(\theta)$. In $\text{Ult}(V, E_k^\theta)$ let $i'_{k\ell} : \text{Ult}(V, E_k^\theta) \rightarrow \text{Ult}(\text{Ult}(V, E_k^\theta), E_{k\ell}^\theta)$ be the canonical elementary embedding. Since θ is inaccessible, for each $a \in [\theta]^{<\aleph_0}$ every $f : [\mu_a^{k\ell}] \rightarrow \theta$ lies in $\text{Ult}(V, E_k^\theta)$; thus $i_{k\ell}^\theta(\theta) = i'_{k\ell}(\theta)$. Since $\text{cr } k < \theta$, $\text{Ult}(V, E_k^\theta) \models i_\ell^\theta(\theta) > \theta$ is inaccessible. Thus $i_\ell^\theta(\theta) > i'_{k\ell}(\theta)$. This proves the claim.

If the theorem failed, pick an inaccessible $\theta < \lambda$ with each $\text{cr}(k_0 \cdots k_n) < \theta$. Then by the claim, for each n , $i_{k_0 \cdots k_n}^\theta(\theta) > i_{k_0 \cdots k_{n+1}}^\theta(\theta)$, a contradiction.

If $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_\lambda$, let $\text{cr } \mathcal{H} = \{\text{cr } k : k \in \mathcal{H}\}$. Note that since every member of $\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{H}$ is a composition of members of $\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{H}$, $\text{cr } \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{H} = \text{cr } \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{H}$ (that fact is also a consequence of Lemma 5 (iv)). For $X \subseteq \text{Ord}$, let $\text{tp } X$ be the order type of X .

Theorem 10. *If $\mathcal{H}$ is a nonempty subset of $\mathcal{E}_\lambda$ and for each $\theta < \lambda$ $\{h \in \mathcal{H} : \text{cr } h < \theta\}$ is finite, then $\text{tp}(\text{cr } \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{H}) = \omega$.*

Proof. Since for every $\theta < \lambda$, $\text{cr } \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{H} \cap \theta = \text{cr } \mathcal{A}_{\{h \in \mathcal{H} : \text{cr } h < \theta\}} \cap \theta$, we are reduced to the case where $\mathcal{H}$ is finite.

For $\vec{p} \in (\mathcal{E}_\lambda)^{<\omega}$, $\vec{p} = \langle p_0, p_1, \dots, p_n \rangle$, let $e(\vec{p}) = p_0 p_1 \cdots p_n$. Let $\mathcal{H}^* = \{e(\vec{h}) : \vec{h} \in (\mathcal{H})^{<\omega}\}$.

Lemma 10.1. *$\text{tp}(\text{cr } \mathcal{H}^*) = \omega$ and $\sup(\text{cr } \mathcal{H}^*) = \lambda$*

Proof. For each $\delta \in \text{cr } \mathcal{H}^*$ pick $\vec{h}_\delta \in (\mathcal{H})^{<\omega}$ of minimal length such that $\text{cr}(e(\vec{h}_\delta)) = \delta$. Then if $\vec{h}_\delta = \langle h_0, h_1, \dots, h_n \rangle$ and $m < n$, then $\text{cr}(h_0 h_1 \cdots h_m) < \delta$. Namely, if $m < n$ is such that $\text{cr}(h_0 h_1 \cdots h_m) \geq \delta$, then $\text{cr}(h_0 h_1 \cdots h_m) = \delta$ would contradict minimality, and $\text{cr}(h_0 h_1 \cdots h_m) > \delta$ would imply $\text{cr}(h_{m+1} \cdots h_n) = \delta$, contradicting minimality.

Now suppose for some $\theta < \lambda$ that $\text{cr } \mathcal{H}^* \cap \theta$ is infinite. Then T , the set of all initial segments of the $\vec{h}_\delta$'s ($\delta \in \text{cr } \mathcal{H}^* \cap \theta$) is a downwards closed, finitely branching,

infinite tree such that for each $\vec{h} \in T$, $\text{cr}(e(\vec{h})) < \theta$. Then an infinite branch through T contradicts Theorem 9.

Let $\gamma_n^{\mathcal{H}} = \gamma_n$ be the n th member of $\text{cr}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}) = \text{cr}(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}})$ ($n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$).

Lemma 10.2. *If $\vec{p} \in (\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}})^{<\omega}$ has length 2^n , then for some initial segment $\vec{q}$ of $\vec{p}$, $\text{cr}(e(\vec{q})) \geq \gamma_n$.*

Proof. The case $n = 0$ is immediate. Suppose it is true for $n - 1$. Let $\vec{p} = \langle p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{2^n} \rangle$. Pick $i \leq 2^{n-1}$ such that $\ell = p_1 \cdots p_i$ has critical point $\geq \gamma_{n-1}$; if $\text{cr } \ell > \gamma_{n-1}$, we are done so suppose $\text{cr } \ell = \gamma_{n-1}$. Pick k , $1 \leq k \leq 2^{n-1}$ minimal so that $\text{cr}(p_{i+1} \cdots p_{i+k}) \geq \gamma_{n-1}$. Then by Lemma 1 (i) and (iii)a, $p_1 \cdots p_{i+k} = \ell p_{i+1} \cdots p_{i+k} \stackrel{\rho}{=} \ell(p_{i+1} \cdots p_{i+k})$ for some $\rho > \gamma_{n-1}$. Thus $\text{cr}(p_1 \cdots p_{i+k}) > \gamma_{n-1}$, since $\text{cr}(\ell(p_{i+1} \cdots p_{i+k})) = \ell(\text{cr}(p_{i+1} \cdots p_{i+k})) > \gamma_{n-1}$ and $\rho > \gamma_{n-1}$. So $\text{cr}(p_1 \cdots p_{i+k}) \geq \gamma_n$.

From Lemma 10.1, it suffices for the theorem to show

Lemma 10.3. $\text{cr } \mathcal{H}^* = \text{cr } \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}}$

Proof. Note that for $p \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}}$, $\gamma < \lambda$, either there is an $h \in \mathcal{H}$ with $p \stackrel{\gamma}{=} h$ or for some $h \in \mathcal{H}$ and $q \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}}$, $p \stackrel{\gamma}{=} qh$. Namely, by Lemma 7 (iv), $p \stackrel{\gamma}{=} r$ for some $r \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Then either $r \in \mathcal{H}$ or r is of the form $a_0(a_1(\cdots(a_n h)))$ for some $h \in \mathcal{H}$, $a_i \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}}$; in the latter case take $q = a_0 \circ a_1 \circ \cdots \circ a_n$.

We need to show that γ_n is the n th member of $\text{cr } \mathcal{H}^*$. Suppose this fails for some n , and pick $p \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}}$ with $\gamma_n = \text{cr } p$. Fix $\gamma > \gamma_n$, and let $p_0 = p$. Inductively pick $p_i \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}}$ (for all $i \leq 2^{n+1}$ if possible) such that for each $m < 2^{n+1}$, $p_{m+1} h_m \stackrel{\gamma}{=} p_m$ for some $h_m \in \mathcal{H}$. If $m < 2^{n+1}$ and $p_0, \dots, p_m$ are chosen but p_{m+1} can't be, then $p_m \stackrel{\gamma}{=} h$ for some h , whence $p \stackrel{\gamma}{=} h h_{m-1} \cdots h_1 h_0$ and $\text{cr } p \in \mathcal{H}^*$. If the p_i 's can be chosen for all $i \leq 2^{n+1}$, then $p \stackrel{\gamma}{=} p_{2^{n+1}} h_{2^{n+1}-1} \cdots h_1 h_0$. By Lemma 10.2, some $\text{cr}(p_{2^{n+1}} h_{2^{n+1}-1} \cdots h_i) \geq \gamma_{n+1}$, where $i > 0$ since $\text{cr } p < \gamma_{n+1}$. But then $p \stackrel{\gamma}{=} (p_{2^{n+1}} h_{2^{n+1}-1} \cdots h_i)(h_{i-1} \cdots h_1 h_0) \stackrel{\gamma}{=} h_{i-1} \cdots h_1 h_0$, giving $\gamma_n \in \text{cr } \mathcal{H}^*$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 10; note that it and the proof of Lemma

10.3 give (for $\mathcal{H}$ as hypothesized in Theorem 10) that for all $\alpha < \lambda$ and $p \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{H}}$

there's a $q \in \mathcal{H}^*$ with $p \stackrel{\gamma}{=} q$.

We consider the case $\mathcal{H} = \{j\}$ below. For $j \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ let $\langle \gamma_n : n < \omega \rangle$ be the increasing enumeration of $\text{cr } \mathcal{A}_j$; so $\gamma_0 = \text{cr } j$. Let $j_{(0)} = \text{id}$ (recall $\text{id} \notin \mathcal{E}_\lambda$), $j_{(1)} = j$ and in general $j_{(n+1)} = j_{(n)}j$. Let $P_n = \{p \bigcap^* V_{\gamma_n} : p \in \mathcal{P}_j\}$. Then from Theorem 10 and the remarks before Lemma 2, if $\cdot$ and $\circ$ are the operations on P_n induced by the projection map $p \rightarrow p \bigcap^* V_{\gamma_n}$, and π_{mn} ($m > n$) is the projection map from P_m to P_n , then $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_j, \mathcal{P}_j, \mathcal{A}_j$ are subalgebras of the inverse limit of $(\langle P_n : n < \omega \rangle, \langle \pi_{mn} : m > n \rangle)$. Parts (iii) and (iv) of the next theorem imply that $\text{Card } P_n = 2^n$.

Theorem 11. (i) $j_{(2^n)}(\text{cr } j_{(2^n)}) = \text{cr } j_{(2^{n+1})}$ (so in particular $\langle \text{cr } j_{(2^n)} : n < \omega \rangle$ is increasing). And $\text{cr } j_{(m)} = \text{cr } j_{(2^n)}$ where n is greatest such that 2^n divides m .

(ii) $\text{cr } j_{(2^n)} = \gamma_n$.

(iii) if $i, m < 2^n$ and $i \neq m$, then $j_{(i)} \bigcap^* V_{\gamma_{n-1}+1} \neq j_{(m)} \bigcap^* V_{\gamma_{n-1}+1}$.

(iv) $P_n = \{j_{(i)} \bigcap^* V_{\gamma_n} : i < 2^n\}$.

Proof. (i) By induction on the maximum ℓ of the subscripts appearing in the expressions. For $\ell \leq 1$ there is nothing to prove.

For the first clause, assuming (i) holds for all $\ell < 2^{n+1}$, we have by induction that $\text{cr } j_{(2^n+i)} < \text{cr } j_{(2^n)}$ ($0 < i < 2^n$). Thus $j_{(2^n)}(\text{cr } j_{(2^n)}) = j_{(2^n)}(j_{(2^n-1)}(\text{cr } j)) = j_{(2^n)+(2^n-1)}(\text{cr } j)$ which, by Lemma 1 (iii)b, $= j_{(2^{n+1}-1)}(\text{cr } j) = \text{cr } j_{(2^{n+1})}$. The second clause of (i) follows using the induction hypothesis.

(ii) By Lemma 10.3 $\{\gamma_n : n < \omega\} = \{\text{cr } j_{(i)} : 0 < i < \omega\}$, which equals $\{\text{cr } j_{(2^n)} : n < \omega\}$ by (i). Since $\langle \text{cr } j_{(2^n)} : n < \omega \rangle$ is increasing, $\text{cr } j_{(2^n)} = \gamma_n$.

(iii) By induction on n . Given $i < m < 2^n$, if $m \neq 2^{n-1} + i$, then the result follows from the induction hypothesis and the fact that $j_{(2^{n-1}+k)} \stackrel{\gamma_{n-1}}{=} j_{(k)}$ ($k < 2^{n-1}$). If $m = 2^{n-1} + i$ and $j_{(i)} \stackrel{\gamma_{n-1}+1}{=} j_{(m)}$, then $2^{n-1} - i$ applications of the rule $p \stackrel{\gamma_{n-1}+1}{=} q \Rightarrow pj \stackrel{\gamma_{n-1}+1}{=} qj$ yield $j_{(2^{n-1})} \stackrel{\gamma_{n-1}+1}{=} j_{(2^n)}$, then contradicting $\text{cr } j_{(2^{n-1})} = \gamma_{n-1} < \text{cr } j_{(2^n)}$.

(iv) Given $p \in \mathcal{P}$. By Lemma 10.3 there is an i with $p \stackrel{\gamma_n}{=} j_{(i)}$; pick i minimal. If $\text{cr } p \geq \gamma_n$, $i = 0$. If $\text{cr } p < \gamma_n$, then if $i \geq 2^n$, we would have by Lemma 10.2 an

Recall that A is the set of terms w in the operation $\cdot$, in one variable x , and for $j \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$, $w[j]$ is the member of $\mathcal{A}_j$ induced by the homomorphism which sends $[x]$ to j .

Theorem 12. $\{\langle u, w \rangle \in A \times A : \text{cr}(u[j]) < \text{cr}(w[j])\}$ is recursive and independent of j .

Proof. The tables of the finite algebras P_k can be defined without reference to large cardinals. Define a binary operation $*_k$ on $2^k = \{0, 1, \dots, 2^k - 1\}$ by

$$m *_k 0 = 0$$

$$m *_k 1 = m + 1 \pmod{2^k}$$

$$m *_k i = [m *_k (i - 1)] *_k [m *_k 1]. \quad (1 < i < 2^k)$$

To see that this constitutes a recursive definition of an operation, note that the equations imply $0 *_k n = n$, $2^k - 1 *_k n = 0$, and (by induction on $m = 0, 2^k - 1, 2^k - 2, \dots, 1$) that $m *_k n = 0$ or $m *_k n > m$. By the latter clause and a similar induction, $m *_k n$ is (uniquely) determined for all $m, n < 2^k$.

We claim that for $m, n, \ell < 2^k$, $m *_k n = \ell$ if and only if $j_{(m)}j_{(n)} \stackrel{\gamma_k}{=} j_{(\ell)}$, i.e., $(2^k, *_k) \cong (J_k, \cdot)$. Namely, $(J_k, \cdot)$ satisfies the first and third equations since $j_{(0)} = \text{id}$ and $(J_k, \cdot)$ is left distributive, and the second holds by definition unless $m = 2^k - 1$, in which case $j_{(2^k-1)}j = j_{(2^k)} \stackrel{\gamma_k}{=} j_{(0)}$. If $v \in A$, $k < \omega$, the unique $i < 2^k$ such that $v[j] \stackrel{\gamma_k}{=} j_{(i)}$ may thus be computed in the algebra $(2^k, *_k)$. And $\text{cr}(v[j]) \geq \gamma_k$ iff $i = 0$, and if $0 < i < 2^k$, then $\text{cr}(v[j]) = \gamma_\ell$, where 2^ℓ is the largest power of 2 dividing i . For sufficiently large k the number i thus associated to w in $(2^k, *_k)$ is nonzero (using the assumption $\exists \lambda \mathcal{E}_\lambda \neq \emptyset$ and its consequence $\sup\{\text{cr } j_{2^n} : n < \omega\} = \lambda$). This gives an algorithm for comparing $\text{cr } w[j]$ with $\text{cr } u[j]$.

A number of statements about $\mathcal{A}_j$ and its members can be coded up as statements about the $(2^k, *_k)$'s, thus reducing them to problems in finite combinatorics, and raising the question whether those versions are provable in ZFC. Wehrung ([15]) proved (in ZFC) that for m a positive integer, the free left-distributive algebra on one generator satisfying $x *_k y = y$ is $(2^k, *_k)$ when k is greatest such

that 2^k divides m . Regarding the result that $\text{tp}(\text{cr}\mathcal{A}_j) = \omega$, it can be phrased finite combinatorially as the statement that each term w in A , evaluated in each $(2^k, *_k)$, is nonzero for eventually all k , or as the statement that for all $i \geq 1$ there's a k with $1 *_k i \neq 0$. These (and other) versions aren't known to be provable in ZFC.

A result of Woodin, using upward Easton forcing, is that it's consistent (relative to the consistency that some $\mathcal{E}_\lambda \neq \emptyset$) that there are $k, \ell \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ with $k \neq \ell$ but $k \restriction \lambda = \ell \restriction \lambda$. However, if for some $j \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$, $k, \ell \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}_j$, then if $k \restriction \lambda = \ell \restriction \lambda$, then $k = \ell$. Namely, let $\text{cr}(j) = \kappa$, $<_\kappa$ a well ordering of V_κ of length κ . Then $<_\lambda = \bigcup_{n < \omega} j^n(<_\kappa)$, the ω th iterate of $<_\kappa$, is a well ordering of V_λ of length λ_j and by induction on $\mathcal{A}_j$ one has that for each $p \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}_j$, $p(<_\lambda) = <_\lambda$. Then if $k(y) \neq \ell(y)$ and y is the α th member of V_λ under $<_\lambda$, then $k(\alpha) \neq \ell(\alpha)$, as desired.

Using Theorem 11, for $j \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$ embeddings $p, q \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}_j$ can be constructed with $p \restriction \text{cr}(\mathcal{A}_j) = q \restriction \text{cr}(\mathcal{A}_j)$ and $p \neq q$. Members of $\mathcal{A}_j$, though, are determined by their restrictions to $\text{cr}(\mathcal{A}_j)$.

Theorem 13. *If $j \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$, $p, q \in \mathcal{A}_j$, $p \neq q$, then $p \restriction \text{cr}\mathcal{A}_j \neq q \restriction \text{cr}\mathcal{A}_j$.*

We remark that counterexamples show that “ $\text{cr}\mathcal{A}_j$ ” can't be replaced in the theorem by “ $\text{cr}\mathcal{A}_n \cap \gamma_n$, where γ_n is least with $p \restriction \gamma_n \neq q \restriction \gamma_n$,” nor can it be replaced by “ $\{j^n(\text{cr} j) : n < \omega\}$.”

Proof of the Theorem.

Lemma 13.1. *If $k \in \mathcal{E}_\lambda$, $\rho < \lambda$, then for some $\delta < \lambda$ with $\text{cr}\delta > \rho$ there is a $\theta \in \text{cr}\mathcal{A}_k$ with $k(<\delta) < \theta < k(\delta)$.*

Proof. Let $k^{(1)} = kk$, $I_n = I_n(k^{(1)}, k)$ ($n < \omega$). Then $\sup_n(\text{cr } I_{2n+1}) = \lambda$ by Lemma 7 (iii). Pick an n such that $\mu = \text{cr } I_{2n+1} > \rho$. Let $\delta = k(<\mu)$, of cofinality $\mu > \rho$.

We have $k(<\delta) = I_{2n+2}(<\mu)$. Namely, $k(<\delta) = k(<k(<\mu)) = k^{(1)}(<k(<\mu)) = (I_1 \circ I_0)(<\mu) = (I_{2n+2} \circ I_{2n+1})(<\mu) = I_{2n+2}(<I_{2n+1}(<\mu)) = I_{2n+2}(<\mu)$ since $\mu = \text{cr } I_{2n+1}$.

We have $k(\delta) = [I_1(<I_0\mu)] > [I_2(<I_1\mu)] > [I_3(<I_2\mu)] > \cdots > [I_{2n+2}(<I_{2n+1}\mu)]$. Namely, $k(\delta) = k(k(<\mu)) = k^{(1)}(<k\mu) = I_1(<I_0\mu)$. To see that

$[I_k(< I_{k-1}\mu)] \gg [I_{k+1}(< I_k\mu)]$ ($k \leq 2n+1$), we have that $I_{k-1}(\mu) > I_{k-1}(< \mu)$ since $\text{cr } I_{k-1} < \mu$ and μ is regular, so $[I_k(< I_{k-1}\mu)] > I_k(I_{k-1}(< \mu)) = I_{k+1}(< I_k\mu)$.

So $k(< \delta) = I_{2n+2}(< \mu) < I_{2n+2}(\mu)$ (since $\text{cr } I_{2n+2} = \text{cr } k < \mu) < [I_{2n+2}(< I_{2n+1}\mu)]$ (since $\text{cr } I_{2n+1} = \mu) < [I_{2n+1}(< I_{2n}\mu)] < \cdots < k(\delta)$. Therefore $\theta = I_{2n+1}(\mu)$ is as desired.

For $w \in A$, let $\bar{w} = w[j]$.

Lemma 13.2. *Suppose $F \subseteq A$ is finite and closed under subterms, $n \geq \text{Card } F$, $\delta < \lambda$, $\text{cr } \delta > \text{cr } \bar{w}$ for all $\bar{w} \in F$. Then, letting $\beta = j^n(< \delta)$, we have*

(i) $\bar{u}(< \beta) = \bar{v}(< \beta)$ (all $u, v \in F$)

(ii) $\bar{u}(\beta) > \overline{uv}(\beta)$ (all $uv \in F$)

Proof. By induction on $\text{Card } F$. If $F = \{x\}$, it is trivial. Suppose $F = F' \cup \{uv\}$, where $uv \notin F'$ and F' is closed under subterms. Given $n \geq \text{Card } F$, $\text{cr } \delta \geq \text{cr } \bar{w}$ (all $w \in F$), $\beta = j^n(< \delta)$.

For (i) we have $\bar{w}(< \beta) = \bar{t}(< \beta)$, all $\bar{x}, t \in F'$. And $\overline{uv}(< \beta) = \overline{uv}(< j^n(< \delta)) = \overline{uv}(< j(< j^{n-1}(< \delta))) = \overline{uv}(< \bar{u}(< j^{n-1}(< \delta)))$ (induction hypothesis) $= \bar{u}(< \bar{v}(< j^{n-1}(< \delta))) = \bar{u}(< j^n(< \delta))$ (induction hypothesis) $= \bar{u}(< \beta)$, as desired.

For (ii), $\bar{u}(\beta) = \bar{u}(j^n(< \delta)) = \bar{u}(j(< j^{n-1}(< \delta))) = \bar{u}(\bar{v}(< j^{n-1}(< \delta))) = \overline{uv}(< \bar{u}(j^{n-1}(< \delta))) > \overline{uv}(\bar{u}(< j^{n-1}(< \delta)))$ (since $\text{cr } j^{n-1}(< \delta) = \text{cr } \delta \geq \text{cr } \bar{u}) = \overline{uv}(\beta)$.

To prove the theorem, let $p, q \in \mathcal{A}_j$, $p \neq q$. Then by Theorem 5 (i), we have, say, $p <_L q$. Take $w \in A$, $\bar{w} = p$, $w = u_0 u_1 \cdots u_m$, $\bar{u}_0 = q$. Let F be the set of all subterms of w . Applying Lemma 13.1 to $k = p$, there is a $\delta < \lambda$ with $\text{cr } \delta \geq \sup\{\text{cr } \bar{w} : w \in F\}$ and a $\theta \in \text{cr } \mathcal{A}_p$ (whence in $\text{cr } \mathcal{A}_j$) with $p(< \delta) < \theta < p(\delta)$.

Let $n = \text{Card } F$, $\beta = j^n(< \delta)$. By Lemma 13.2, $q(\beta) = \bar{u}_0 > \overline{u_0 u_1}(\beta) > \cdots > \overline{u_0 u_1 \cdots u_m}(\beta) = p(\beta)$, and $\bar{u}(< \beta) = \bar{v}(< \beta)$ (all $u, v \in F$). Claim there is a $\gamma \in \text{cr } \mathcal{A}_j$ with $p(< \beta) < \gamma < p(\beta)$. Namely, since $p(< \delta) < \theta < p(\delta)$, we have $p(< \beta) = p(< j^n(< \delta)) = p j^n(< p(< \delta)) < p j^n(\theta) < p j^n(< p\delta) = p(j^n(< \delta)) = p(\beta)$. Take $\gamma = p j^n(\theta)$.

We claim that for $i \leq m$, $\overline{u_0 u_1 \cdots u_i}(\beta) > \overline{u_0 u_1 \cdots u_{i-1}}(\beta)$. Namely, $\overline{u_0 u_1 \cdots u_i}(\beta) >$

$\overline{u_0 \cdots u_i}(p(< \beta)) = (\overline{u_0 \cdots u_i})(\overline{u_{i+1}}(< \beta)) = \overline{u_0 \cdots u_i u_{i+1}}(< \overline{u_0 \cdots u_i}(\beta)) > \overline{u_0 \cdots u_{i+1}}(p(\beta)) >$
 $\overline{u_0 \cdots u_{i+1}}(\gamma)$. Thus $q(\gamma) = \bar{u}_0(\gamma) > \overline{u_0 \cdots u_m}(\gamma) = p(\gamma)$, proving the theorem.

References

- [1] P. Dehornoy, Free distributive groupoids, *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* **61** (1989), 123–146.
- [2] P. Dehornoy, Sur la structure des gerbes libres, *CRAS Paris* **309-I** (1989), 143–148.
- [3] P. Dehornoy, Braid groups and left distributive operations, preprint.
- [4] R. Dougherty, Critical points of elementary embeddings, handwritten notes, 1988.
- [5] A. Kanamori, W. Reinhardt and R. Solovay, Strong axioms of infinity and elementary embeddings, *Ann. Math. Logic* **13** (1978), 73–116.
- [6] A. Kanamori, Large cardinals, Springer.
- [7] K. Kunen, Elementary embeddings and infinitary combinatorics, *J. Symb. Logic* **36** (1971), 407–413.
- [8] D. Larue, On braid words and irreflexivity, *Algebra Universalis*
- [9] R. Laver, The left distributive law and the freeness of an algebra of elementary embeddings, *Advances in Mathematics* **91** (1992), 209–231.
- [10] R. Laver, A division algorithm for the free left distributive algebra, *Proc. Helsinki 1990 ASL Meeting*,
- [11] D. A. Martin and J. Steel, A proof of projective determinacy, *Jour. Amer. Math. Soc.* **2** (1989), 71–125.
- [12] D. A. Martin and J. Steel, Iteration trees, *Jour. Amer. Math. Soc.*
- [13] W. Mitchell, Sets constructible from sequences of ultrafilters, *JSL* **39** (1974), 57–66.
- [14] J. Steel, The well foundedness of the Mitchell order, preprint.
- [15] F. Wehrung, Gerbes primitives, *CRAS Paris*, 1991.

University of Colorado, Boulder.